

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-33 are the claims that have been examined in the present application. Claims 1-6, 17-22 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149854) in view of Gonzales (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161603). Claims 7-12, 14-15, 23-28 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennell in view of Gonzales and Winkler (US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0137507). Claims 13, 16, 29, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervention claims.

**Preliminary Matters**

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the prior art rejection of claims 1-4, 17-20 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pennell in view of the arguments presented in the Response filed March 9, 2006.

**Allowable subject matter**

*Claims 13, 16, 29, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervention claims.*

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 13, 16, 29 and 32 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold in abeyance such rewriting until the Examiner has had an opportunity to reconsider (and withdraw) the prior art rejection of the other claims.

**§103 Rejections**

A. *Claims 1-6, 17-22 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149854) in view of Gonzales (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161603).*

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a multimedia completing unit that completes the template document as a multimedia document by fixing the floating field detected by the template document floating field detecting unit to be an object designated by the information selected by the user among the list of selectable objects when the information selected by the user is received through the user selection information receiving unit.” The Examiner argues that Pennell teaches this aspect of the present invention, citing FIG. 7, element 100 as support.

Applicant submits that Pennell fails to teach or suggest fixing the floating field detected by the template document. Pennell teaches that the form blanks in the pop-up dialogue window may be altered, changed or held only temporarily. Once the web site which contains the pop-up dialogue window is exited, all of the fields in the form are reset as blank. Therefore, the fields are not “fixed” such that they cannot be altered, and Pennell fails to teach fixing the floating field.

Further, the Examiner concedes that Pennell fails to teach the creation of a multimedia document as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner claims that Gonzales cures the defect noted in Pennell. Gonzales teaches that a template may be used for the submission of an article by an author to an editor, and further, to a publisher. The created article may ultimately be interpreted as a multimedia document. However, Gonzales fails to disclose that the fields of the

template are fixed at any time. While the substance of the article may be saved while the template is in use, the fields are never fixed such that they cannot be changed. The author, and the editor, both have the ability to alter and change the substance of the potential article. Therefore, Gonzales also fails to teach “fixing the floating field detected by the template document floating field detecting unit.” Claim 1 is patentable over the applied art.

Claims 2-6 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 17 recites similar limitations to those found in claim 1. Therefore, for reasons analogous to those found with regard to claim 1, claim 17 is patentable over the applied art.

Claims 18-22 and 33 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 17.

*B. Claims 7-12, 14-15, 23-28 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennell in view of Gonzales and Winkler (US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0137507).*

Independent claims 7 and 23 contain similar limitations to those noted above in claims 1 and 17. Since Pennell and Gonzales fail to disclose all of the elements of claims 1 and 17, they also fails to disclose those similar elements of claims 7 and 23. Because Winkler fails to cure the deficiencies noted in Pennell and Gonzales, claims 7 and 23 are patentable over the applied art since the combined references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims.

Claims 8-12, 14-15, 24-28 and 30-31 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 7 and 23, respectively.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Kevin C. Kunzendorf 58308 /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Kevin C. Kunzendorf  
Registration No 58,308

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 1, 2006